REMARKS

This amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination. Applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 12-35, 38-43, 46-53, 56-59, 62-85, 88-93 and 96-100 are pending in the application. Claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 36, 37, 44, 45, 54, 55, 60, 61, 86, 87, 94, 95 and 101-108 have been cancelled, and claims 13-34, 39-42, 47-50, 63-84, 89-92 and 97-100 having been withdrawn from consideration. Of the claims under consideration, claims 1, 7, 35, 43, 51, 57, 85 and 93 are independent, and claims 1-3, 6-9, 12, 35, 38, 43, 46, 51-53, 56-59, 62, 85, 88, 93 and 96 have been amended. Support for these amendments may be found in the application at, for example, page 11, line 3 to page 16, line 2 and Figs. 7 and 8. No new matter has been introduced.

Rejection under Section 103

Claims 1-12, 35-38, 43-46, 51-62, 85-88, 93-96 and 101-108 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ritter (U.S. Patent No. 6,657,538) in view of Harkin (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,376). Applicant has cancelled claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 36, 37, 44, 45, 54, 55, 60, 61, 86, 87, 94, 95 and 101-108, which renders the rejection of these claims moot. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the other claims because neither Ritter, Harkin nor any proper combination of the references describes or suggests the subject matter of independent claims 1, 7, 35, 43, 51, 57, 85 and 93.

Amended claim 1 recites a system for identifying an individual including, *inter alia*, a display device having pixels. Each of the pixels includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user. The light emitting element includes a cathode, a light emitting layer, and an anode.

In contrast, Ritter discloses techniques for authenticating persons by processing video information of body features of a user to derive a personal biometric key that then is stored on a SIM-card for later use in authenticating the user. See Ritter at Abstract. See also Ritter at FIG. 1 (showing a communication terminal 1 having a SIM-card 3 and a video sensor 2 for recording

body patterns) and col. 3, line 57 to col. 4, line 47 (describing FIG. 1). To be authenticated in Ritter's system using the video sensor, a user looks into the video sensor 2 and/or puts a specific finger onto the video sensor. See Ritter at col. 4, lines 30-32. Data recorded by the video sensor is compared with the stored personal biometric key for the user, and the user is permitted to use the mobile telephone when the comparison is positive. See Ritter at col. 4, lines 32-45. However, Ritter does not describe or suggest a display device having pixels, much less a display device having pixels in which each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user, as recited in claim 1.

Harkin discloses a fingerprint sensor in combination with a flat panel display device. See Harkin at col. 9, lines 16-17. Harkin identifies a liquid crystal display device and an electroluminescent or electrochromic display as examples of display devices. See Harkin at col. 9, lines 17-18 and 64-67. Notably, Harkin discloses the display device 70 and the fingerprint sensor 10 are separate elements. For example, Harkin states:

> As shown in FIG. 6, the display device and the fingerprint sensor 10 are of corresponding size and the fingerprint sensor is disposed directly over the upper plate, here referenced 72, of the display device on its output side with the fingerprint sensing array uppermost.

Harkin at col. 9, lines 30-34. Harkin also describes the fingerprint sensor as being substantially transparent, which allows the display produced by the liquid crystal display device at the region underlying the sensor to be visible through the fingerprint sensor. See Harkin at col. 9, lines 47-49. Harkin also describes that row and column conductors in a sensor array can be aligned with row and column conductors in a display element array. See Harkin at col. 9, lines 56-64. Harkin discloses that the fingerprint sensor may be incorporated in a display window of a telephone housing overlying a liquid crystal display device. See Harkin at col. 10, lines 17-21 (referring to Fig. 7).

Hence, Harkin discloses a display device that is separate from a fingerprint sensor. As such, Harkin does not describe or suggest a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user, as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, Harkin's fingerprint sensing device does not cure Ritter's

failure to describe or suggest a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, neither Ritter, Harkin, nor any proper combination of the references describes or suggests a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user, as recited in claim 1. For at least these reasons, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, and its dependent claims 2, 3 and 6.

Additionally, one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to combine the system of Ritter with the system of Harkin. Ritter discloses techniques for authenticating persons by processing video information of body features of a user to derive a personal biometric key that then is stored on a SIM-card for later use in authenticating the user. In contrast, Harkin discloses a fingerprint sensor that scans a fingerprint that is placed on a sensing surface. See Harkin at col. 6, lines 58-60. Nothing in Ritter or Harkin would have provided motivation to incorporate Harkin's fingerprint sensor in Ritter's system. Indeed, doing so would seem to be contrary to the video approach described by Ritter.

Amended independent claims 7, 35 and 43 each recite a system for identifying an individual that includes a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user. Accordingly, for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 7, 35 and 43 and their dependent claims 8, 9, 12, 38 and 46.

Amended independent claims 51, 57, 85 and 93 each recite a portable information device that includes a display device having pixels, where each pixel includes a light emitting element and a sensor for reading biological information of a user. Accordingly, for at least the reasons described above with respect to claim 1, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 51, 57, 85 and 93 and their dependent claims 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 62, 88 and 96.

Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Enclosed is a $790.00 check for the Request for Continued Examination fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 13, 2005

Barbara A Benoit

Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331